

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

15. εὐχῆ Βασηλήου πρεσβυτέρου [τ]ε[λι]όθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον ὑπὸ Λέοντος τοῦ ἁγιοτάτου μητροπολίτου ἕως Κοσταντίνου τοῦ ἁγιοτάτου μητροπολίτου ἔτ(η) αν'. κὲ ἐλ[θ]όντος¹ μου ἐν ἀδυναμίᾳ κὲ μὴ δυναμένον μου ἐκτελῖν τὰ θῆα δηδάγματα, ἔκουσῆα μου τῷ γνόμ[η] κὲ αὐθερετοβουλῆ (or as two words) παρετησάμην τὴν πολυπόθητον τοῦ Χ(ριστ)οῦ λειτουργίαν, τῇ δὲ προσευχῇ ἐπημένεμε, κὲ παρακαλῶ τὸν ἐλεήμοναν ὡς εὐσπλάχνος μου δὸς ἀ[μ]αρτιμάτων ἄφεσην ἅμα κὲ Ἑρίνις τίς συνβήου μο[v].

ἐ[γρ]ά[φ]θι διὰ χιρ[ὸ]ς Β[α]σ[ι]λίου πρεσ[βυτέ]ρου μινὶ Σεπτεβρίου ιν. δ'.

The text is very worn and extremely difficult, the letters are rude, the lines irregular, and the stone friable. Unless it had been protected by the arch from the weather, the stone would have been quite illegible. And unless I had had the opportunity of studying the inscription for three weeks in all states of the light, I could not have deciphered the text completely. As stated above, I am greatly indebted to M. Clermont Ganneau. *δυναμένον* is certain.

16. On the west front of the northern enlargement of the narthex of No. VII. at Deghli.

ἔνθα κῆτε Σέργγης μνη (sic!) ιδ' Ὀκτουβρηῶν.

17. Above the arcades and apse of the nave of No. III. at Bin Bir Kilsse. The southern arcades had fallen in, when I copied the inscription in 1882; all have now fallen. [οἱ δεινές] τὸ κολλῆγιν ἐν κοινῷ εὐξάμενοι ἐτέ[λεσαν or λείωσαν]. No 1 is on the outside of the apse of the church.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE DISCIPLE WHOM JESUS LOVED.

IN the second part of the Fourth Gospel, which deals exclusively with the Lord's Supper, the Cross, and the Resurrection, the Evangelist introduces a figure elsewhere unknown, "the Disciple whom Jesus loved." This portion of the Gospel is doubly marked off from the first twelve chapters, which deal with the public ministry; (a) by the general reflections on the results of Jesus' public work in xii. 37-50;

¹ Perhaps *ἐνότος*, as I formerly read, is right; but I think the text is AI (where I is followed by a blurred space for a square θ) and not N (followed by a hole in the stone left empty by the engraver).

(b) by the transition in xiii. 1 to those to whom Jesus now gave Himself exclusively, "His own which were in the world," whom as His beloved "He loved unto the end." Among these one is conspicuous as "the beloved disciple" *par éminence*. He is not merely [Jesus' "friend" (*φίλος*), as Lazarus was (xi. 3, 11), but his *ἀγαπητός*, as Jesus Himself is the *Ἀγαπητός* of the Father; He is the type of true discipleship. This distinction the author of the mediating appendix, chap. xxi., does not venture to claim even for Peter (xxi. 15, 16, 17), but lays it at the feet of "the disciple that testifieth these things and wrote these things." In a veiled way the author of the appendix, whom we may designate R (Redactor), allows it to appear that *he* understands by it John the son of Zebedee, so that thenceforth this identification has become current. But its verification depends on the content of the work *without* the Appendix.

In the substance of the work the Beloved Disciple appears but three times; at the Supper, at the Cross, and at the Tomb. Except at the Cross he is introduced in association with Peter, but certainly not as of lower rank. Rather he appears in both the other scenes in the rôle of one who precedes Peter, the fountain authority of the Church's evangelic tradition, in apprehension of the real significance of what transpires. At the cross, where Peter's absence is painfully conspicuous, he becomes by appointment of Jesus Himself the guardian of Jesus' mother.

From these three interrelated appearances of the Beloved Disciple it is important to distinguish two other groups of passages which fall outside our consideration because they either are (a) indefinite, and need not refer to the same, nor indeed to any specific individual; or else (b) are from a later writer, who may easily have attached a different meaning to the phrase "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

In the former category of indefinite references are to be placed (1) those of John i. 35-42, where the analogy with Mark i. 16-20 may well lead the reader mentally to introduce the figures of James and John. But not only have we here no allusion whatever to "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the phenomenon is not even connected primarily with the introduction of this new personality. Its real explanation must be found in connexion with the general question, "Why is there no mention in the Fourth Gospel of the *two* sons of Zebedee, James and John, the "sons of thunder" ?¹ This is an entirely separate problem. Perhaps the unnamed one of the two disciples of John i. 40 may be one of the sons of Zebedee, and some may even find a trace of the brother in the fact that "Andrew findeth first (*πρῶτον*, i.e. before he found others; cf. ver. 43, *τῆ ἐπαύριον εὕρισκει Φίλιππον*) his brother Cephas." For some reason the Fourth Evangelist avoids mention of either of the sons of Zebedee. But what light does this throw upon the question who is meant by "the disciple whom Jesus loved" ?

(2) In the account of Peter's Denial, John xviii. 15-27, a synoptic story intimately connected with the Appendix (cf. xxi. 15-19), we have again the indefinite mention of "another disciple known to the high-priest," who procures Peter's admission to the court and then disappears. There is nothing to prove that this was "the disciple whom Jesus loved"; the inference is simply suggested to the reader's mind in view of Mark xiv. 33, perhaps intentionally, as is almost certainly the case in the Appendix.

(b) Unlike the Gospel as a whole (1) the Appendix introduces openly "the sons of Zebedee" (xxi. 2). A penumbra of indefiniteness is secured by the addition to the list of

¹ For a possible solution of this question, see my article, "The Martyr Apostles," in *EXPOSITOR*, 1907.

five mentioned by name in xxi. 2, of "two other of His disciples," possibly because of interest in the number seven.¹ But given "the two sons of Zebedee," the process of elimination becomes so easy that the reader cannot really fail to identify "the disciple whom Jesus loved, which also leaned back on his breast at the supper, and said, Lord, who is he that betrayeth Thee?" (John xxi. 20) with the "witness-bearer" who, according to the Appendix, "beareth witness of these things and wrote these things" (xxi. 24). The author of the Appendix, accordingly, supplies the missing "sons of Zebedee," and, without positively so stating, leads the reader to infer that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is John, the survivor of the two. As the passage on Peter's Denial (John xiii. 36-38; xviii. 15-18, 25-27) is so intimately connected with the Appendix² it is reasonable to infer that the nameless "other disciple known to the high-priest" of this story (xviii. 10 f.) is meant to be understood in the same way. The reader of chaps. xviii. f. might well ask, How is it, after the disciples have "gone their way,"³ that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" can still be beside Him at the foot of the cross, xix. 26? The answer (of R) is the introduction in xviii. 15 f., together with his insertion of the incident of Peter's Denial, of the "other disciple known to the high-priest." The trait may have been suggested by the following of the "young man" (usually identified as John surnamed Mark) of Mark xiv. 51 f. Other reasons

¹ Cf. the seven in Papias, and *Clem. Hom.* xviii., xiv., the patriarchs, as "the seven pillars of the world." In Gal. ii. 9, Peter, James and John are "pillars" (cf. Rev. iii. 12). Was the early church, like "the world," and like "Wisdom's house" (Prov. ix. 1), conceived as built on seven pillars?

² On this story as an insertion, along with other material related to Synoptic tradition by the author of the Appendix, see Bacon, *Introd. to N. T. Lit.*, p. 274.

³ John xviii. 8f., the Johannine euphemism for the desertion of the eleven, Mark xiv. 27, 50; Luke omits.

concur to prove this whole story of Peter's Denial an interpolation by R.¹ Were it part of the original stock, whose interpreter of events is "the disciple whom Jesus loved," we should expect this title, and not the indefinite "another disciple known to the high-priest."

As both (a) indefinite, and (b) redactional, John xviii. 15 falls outside our consideration. Whether the writer of the Gospel in its original form had a reason for omitting "the sons of Zebedee," and whether his new figure of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" was meant as a substitute for them, and if so, was a mere periphrase for "John," is a question quite independent of ours: What or whom did the first author mean by "the disciple whom Jesus loved"? For we are not confined to redactors' theories of the authorship and meaning of the writings they edit, whether in the New Testament or the Old.

(2) Whatever be the derivation in whole or in part of John xix. 31-37, the famous crux of xix. 35 cannot be fairly interpreted without taking into consideration its manifest relation to xxi. 24. The phraseology alone would compel us here to recognize the hand of R. Once more we find the indefinite "He that saw it" (ὁ ἑωρακώς) brought into the same mysterious relation with "the disciple whom Jesus loved" as in the Appendix. The writer will not say in so many words, "This was 'the disciple whom Jesus loved';" still less "This was John the son of Zebedee," but he makes it impossible to think of anyone else. Phraseology, interest in authentication, method pursued, are those of R. We have no alternative but to class John xix. 35 with the references which are both (a) indefinite and (b) redactional. It is R who speaks, and his intention is that the witness of the "blood and water" from Jesus' side shall be taken to be no other than "the disciple whom

¹ Bacon, *Introd. to N. T.*, 1900, p. 274.

Jesus loved" of verse 26. Whether he also means that this disciple shall be identified with the author of 1 John and 3 John depends upon our judgment of the relation of John xix. 34f. to 1 John v. 6-9 and 3 John 12. The present writer sees no insuperable obstacle to understanding the reference *ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν* of the emphatic "witness" of 1 John v. 6-9. In that case R will be not only asserting his conviction that the phenomenon of the blood and water was witnessed by "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (in his view John), but in addition that it is the same who, in the Epistles whose language he borrows, lays such stress upon the "water and blood," declaring this to be a "witness of the Spirit" in some sense present and eternal. R's standpoint, in other words, is identically that of subsequent tradition, except that instead of plain statement he shelters himself behind purposed ambiguity.

To test the value of R's answer to the question: Who is meant by "the disciple whom Jesus loved," we must now return to the three unequivocal entries of this figure upon the stage, and ask ourselves what their significance is in the light of the original context. We may distinguish between the general context of the writing as a whole, and the individual context of each of the three entries, considering the latter first.

1. John xiii. 1-30. The extraordinary character of the Johannine story of the Last Supper is quite inadequately stated when it is simply pointed out that it is not the Pass-over; that it has not the institution of the Eucharist, which this Evangelist, on the contrary, connects with the Feeding of the Multitude, John vi., a narrative of the Agape cycle; and that it almost eclipses the Eucharist by the emphasis laid upon the new rite of foot-washing, which Jesus institutes in perpetuity (ver. 15) as His own complement to the rite of baptism (ver. 10). All this is

surprising enough when we reflect what significance already attached, even in Paul's time, to the story of the institution of the sacrament by Jesus at the supper "that same night in which he was betrayed" (1 Cor. xi. 20, 23 ff.). But it is not the whole truth. In John xiii. 1-30 the supper is not a Passover, and not a Eucharist. There is a sacrament, with the bread and the cup after supper. But it is a sacrament for only one of those present—"the son of perdition," and for him it is a sacrament of judgment! By it "Satan entered into him." There is no need to exaggerate. The phenomenon has not so startling an effect as it would have if this were new material introduced by the Fourth Evangelist *de suo*, instead of being a mere retention of the synoptic trait of the Betrayer whose "hand dipped with his Master in the dish" (Matthew xxvi. 21-25 = Mark xiv. 18-21 = Luke xxii. 21-23). It is significant enough as being the *only* trait which the Fourth Evangelist sees fit to preserve from the story of the Lord's Supper. The removal of the institutional teachings to a connexion with the story of the origin of the Agape in vi. 52-58, the removal of connexion with the Passover, and the substitution of the rite of foot-washing for the Eucharist have their explanation, no doubt, in the Evangelist's own view of these rites, and of their relation to Judaism on the one side, Gnosticism on the other. This particular trait, retained alone from the synoptic story of the Supper, can only be explained by the desire to counteract a false value attached by some to the Eucharist. Two passages throw light upon it. (1) The Evangelist's own teachings regarding the sacrament in vi. 52-71; (2) the teaching of Paul in 1 Corinthians xi. 29 f. concerning that eating of the bread and drinking of the cup unworthily, which becomes a sacrament of judgment and death to those that "discern not the Lord's body."

(1) As regards the Evangelist's view of the sacrament expressed in the chapter on the Agape (chap. vi.) I cannot do better than transcribe the excellent exposition of Mr. E. F. Scott.¹

The discourse in this chapter is based on the preceding miracle, which, in accordance with John's method, becomes the symbolical expression of a permanent religious fact. Christ dispenses to the world the bread of life. He has in Himself an inexhaustible divine life which He imparts from age to age to those who believe on Him. How is this life communicated? It might appear from the earlier portion of the discourse as if the process were conceived as wholly spiritual. Jesus demands a true belief on Himself as the revelation of God, a living communion with Him, an assimilation of our nature to His. But this spiritual process is associated, more and more definitely as the chapter draws to a close, with the ordinance of the Eucharist: "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I give for the life of the world" (vi. 51). "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you" (53). "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him" (56). In sayings like these we have direct allusion to the Eucharist as the "medicine of immortality" (Ignat. *Eph.* 20), the means of fellowship between Christ and the believer, the real appropriation of the body and blood of the Lord.

In this chapter, therefore, we seem to have two views wholly contradictory to each other. The imparting of the bread of life, typified in the miracle, is the communication by Jesus of His own mind and spirit to His disciples. It is also identified in a special manner with the outward rite of the Eucharist. The contradiction is partly to be explained as an instance of John's peculiar method. He does not discard the common beliefs, even when they clash with his own, but accepts them formally in order to interpret and spiritualize them. In the present instance he takes the popular conception of the religious value of the Supper, and sets it in the light of a higher and more reasonable conception. The outward ordinance becomes symbolical of the true communion with Christ by a life of faith and obedience. To "eat His flesh and drink His blood" is to appropriate His Spirit, to make yourself one with Him, so that He seems to live again in His disciple. John himself points us to some such symbolical import in his words, by the warning with which the discourse closes: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing" (vi. 63).

¹ *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology.* E. F. Scott, 1906, p. 123.

(2) To this strong reaction against the popular, crudely superstitious, and non-ethical view of the sacrament as a "medicine of immortality," the Evangelist joins, however, as Scott correctly observes, a mysticism of his own, producing a conception not wholly freed from the magical element, but certainly able to plead even in this respect the great authority of Paul (1 Cor. xi. 29 f.). The sacrament is the means by which one appropriates Christ's spirit, by which one's life is fed by the divine life of the Logos. Because this is something more than an ethical participation, unworthy eating has not merely moral but physical consequences. The open channel of divine grace becomes the opportunity of Satan, to the judgment and death of the unworthy participant. This Pauline doctrine of the *sacrament of judgment* is embodied by our Evangelist in the story of the Designation of the Traitor, the sole feature he thinks it worth his while to retain from the synoptic account of the Supper. "The disciple whom Jesus loved" is made the hierophant of this mystery. the question vainly put by the twelve in the synoptic story "which of them it was that should do this thing,"¹ is answered to this confidant of Jesus' bosom, who is given to understand its working. It is at the solicitation of Peter that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" obtains the explanation; but it does not appear when, if ever, Peter was told the result. Doctrinally, therefore, the teaching our Evangelist finds in the synoptic story of Judas "dipping in the dish" with Jesus at the last Supper is expressed in 1 Corinthians x. 20-22, "I would not that ye should have communion with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the

¹ It is quite uncertain whether our Matthew was known to the Fourth Evangelist (xii. 8 is wanting in Syr-Sin). If so, Matthew xxvi. 25 will have been understood (correctly ?) as a refusal to assume the responsibility of a categorical answer.

cup of devils ; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of devils." He intimates that it is possible to make even of the Lord's Supper a sacrament of damnation.

It should be needless to say that this is not history, but doctrinal interpretation. No disciple of flesh and blood could have received the positive assurance of the traitorous purpose entertained by Judas, and permitted the traitor to walk forth before his eyes to its accomplishment, without lifting a finger to prevent it. But the disciple of John xiii. 23-30 is not a disciple of flesh and blood. He is the interpreter of the "Petrine" story of the announcement of the betrayal. And he interprets it on the basis of the Pauline doctrine of the sacrament of judgment.

2. John xix. 25-27 deals with the synoptic scene of the Women at the Cross, Matthew xxvii. 55 f. = Mark xv. 41 f. = Luke xxiii. 49. Among these the Fourth Evangelist introduces the mother of Jesus, whose presence, in view of the silence of the synoptic Gospels, and the statements of Mark iii. 21, 31 ff., is somewhat surprising. That of a disciple is even more surprising, in view of the desertion of all which forms so ineradicable an element of the tradition. The entire Johannine scene, so contrary to the representation of all the synoptic Gospels, where the women "stood afar off, beholding" (John xix. 25, "stood by the cross"), and to the historical presuppositions of an execution of this character, suggests that here too it is not a flesh and blood disciple, nor a flesh and blood mother, that enters upon the scene. This mother might rather be she of whom Jesus speaks in Luke xi. 27 f., "they that hear the word of God and keep it"; perhaps in a narrower sense the representative of the adherents of an older faith which had not known the day of its visitation, finding a home with that younger *ecclesia* which took its start from the

cross as the essence and substance of the gospel.¹ For it was not only a conversion of the Gentile world which the great Apostle of the Gentiles looked forward to as the goal of his preaching of "Christ and Him crucified." Paul represented a larger catholicity. At the date of the Fourth Gospel the church of "the circumcision" was a mere remnant of Israel, reconciled (except for an unrecognized heretical element) to the Pauline doctrine of the cross, in fellowship with the church of the uncircumcision, and sustained by it, not to say dependent on it. Already in Paul's lifetime he had established the principle that the Gentile Church should contribute of their carnal things to the poor saints in Jerusalem, whose debtors they were in spiritual things. And beyond even this great achievement there lay in his prophetic vision a grafting in of the natural branches of Israel upon their own olive tree (Rom. xi. 13-32). The author of John xii. 20-32 cannot have been less catholic than Paul in interpreting the significance of the cross. The adaptation which he makes, in xix. 25-27, of the synoptic scene of the Women at the Cross suggests, therefore, in a writer admittedly devoted to symbolism, a Pauline interest in those who were Jesus' "kindred according to the flesh," and probably were his own as well. Like Paul, he finds in the doctrine of the cross the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile; he expects even a dwelling of Shem in the tents of Japheth. But here again the hierophant of the "ministration of the Gentiles" is "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

3. John xx. contains the Fourth Evangelist's only narratives of the Resurrection and the Great Commission. That of the Appendix (xxi. 1 ff.) is by common consent the work

¹ Cf. the taking refuge by the mother of Messiah in Revelation xii. 6 "in the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that there they may nourish her a thousand two hundred and threescore days," perhaps referring to the flight of the church to Pella from Jerusalem.

of a later hand. For R's story of a return of seven of the disciples to their fishing in Galilee is clearly out of harmony with the preceding account of their receiving the Great Commission in Jerusalem (xx. 21-23). Wellhausen¹ has even serious objections to urge against the originality of xx. 24-29 also, because it introduces Thomas as an absentee on that supreme occasion. Whatever the cogency or the inadequacy of this latter plea, the whole content of the resurrection story as related by the synoptic writers, from their account of the empty tomb to the Great Commission and the Pentecostal endowment with the Spirit, is covered by our Evangelist in three scenes, the Empty Tomb (xx. 1-10), the Appearance to Mary Magdalene (xx. 11-18), and the Mission of the Twelve (xx. 19-23). The first at the tomb, the first to believe, was "the disciple whom Jesus loved." He appears as a kind of invisible companion of Peter in the hurried visit to the tomb borrowed from Luke xxiv. 12.² Neither of the two speaks to, nor appears to notice, his companion. The new-found faith of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" does not express itself to Mary Magdalene, who is left "standing without, weeping"; nor even to any of the disciples. His coming and seeing the empty tomb and believing, is all an episode introduced into the Lucan story of the women at the sepulchre without the faintest trace of an effect upon the course of the narrative. Again we must say this is no disciple of flesh and blood. All is precisely as if he were not there. His function indeed has no regard for the persons and conditions of that age. The empty tomb was enough for him. "He saw and believed." He is the type of that faith which does not wait for ocular demonstration, but is quickened

¹ *Erweiterungen u. Aenderungen im Vierten Evangelium*, 1907, p. 27.

² The verse is omitted in some MSS., but the incident is referred to in xxiv. 24, which appears in all.

to full life by "knowing the Scripture that He must rise from the dead." (ver. 9). On independent grounds we must agree with Wellhausen.

The rebuke of Thomas is needless for those who can follow the example of "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Sight for all save the first witnesses must be limited to the empty sepulchre. Their belief must rest upon "the Scripture," where Paul had founded it (1 Cor. xv. 4). Such, as against Peter's, is the faith of "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

In the light of these three individual contexts is it a son of Zebedee, even a glorified son of Zebedee, that the original author intends to present under the mask of "the disciple whom Jesus loved"? Is it both this and his own personality? If so, he uses a strange title,¹ and has a strange way of describing his hero. We are told that it is modesty which accounts for this; the author shrinks from introducing himself by name. Strange modesty, which prefers a title of extreme and exclusive honour to the simple pronoun or mention of the name; and which introduces the personality only to place it in contrast with the weakness and blindness of the rest of the Twelve! We are told that this veiled introduction of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is one of the "touches of the eye-witness." And yet of all the unreal scenes of this gospel of abstractions none are so unreal, none of the *dramatis personae* so phantasmal, as "the beloved disciple" himself, and the symbolic adaptations of synoptic scenes in which he figures.

Let us then turn from that interpretation of this veiled figure which R has imposed on later tradition by his interpo-

¹ Zahn seriously considers the possibility of accounting for the title on the basis of the legend in the Leucian *Acts of John*, where John is the *παρθένος* of Revelation xiv. 4, prevented from accomplishing his intended marriage in order to be reserved for Christ. This is inverting cause and effect.

lations in and additions to the Gospel, and frame for ourselves an interpretation on the basis of the broader context of the original work viewed as a whole.

The view many times advanced since Scholten that the "beloved disciple" is a purely ideal figure is surely more in accord with the nature of his entry on the scene in the three individual contexts just discussed, than that which R has imposed on all subsequent traditional interpretation. In some sense he is an ideal figure, that ideal disciple whom Jesus would choose, and who reads his soul aright. What, then, is ideal discipleship in the Fourth Evangelist's conception? What message will he be supposed to obtain, who reads the very soul of Jesus? To these questions "the spiritual Gospel" leaves room for but one answer. Rarely has it been better stated than in the work of Mr. Scott, from which we have already quoted an exposition of the Johannine doctrine of the sacrament. The essence of the gospel of Christ for our Evangelist centres in the great word "life." He makes himself the great vindicator (*goel*) of Paul, for whom the redemption had been simply "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus making me free from the law of sin and death." To the Fourth Evangelist, as to Paul, the gospel is not precept, but personality and power; "the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelling in you." The cardinal ideas of the Fourth Gospel are defined in the conclusion of the volume we have quoted in three fundamental principles: "(1) Jesus Christ in his actual Person is the revelation of God. (2) The peculiar work of Jesus was to impart Life. (3) The life is communicated through union with Christ. It was inherent in His own Person, and before it can reappear in His disciples they must become in some sense identified with Himself."¹ From these cardinal principles of the

¹ E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 360 ff.

Fourth Gospel it should be possible to deduce the Evangelist's conception of the ideal disciple.

In one sense he must needs correspond to the author himself, whose insight into the deeper meaning of the gospel is the occasion of his writing. With all those who have not seen and yet have believed, the gospel has come to our Evangelist through union with the eternal Christ, the Logos of God. He is of those who, with the great Apostle to the Gentiles, if they had known a Christ after the flesh would know such a Christ no more. He has apprehended him *sub specie eternitatis*, and abides in His bosom, as the glorified Redeemer Himself abides in the bosom of the Father. In the sacrament, at the cross, in the resurrection, he has "put on Christ," and in Him has appropriated the eternal life of God. The ideal disciple cannot be less. He must be an interpreter of the evangelic tradition of Peter in the deeper, larger sense.

But the name by which our author chooses to designate this ideal disciple, suggests another factor in his thought. The "disciple whom Jesus loved" is something more and other than a purely ideal figure. He is not so much ideal as idealized. A very real man has sat for the portrait; but this is not a case of self-portraiture.

We have seen that the "beloved disciple" enters on the scene only in the drama of the cross and resurrection. His gospel of redemption is his by mystic union with Christ in the fellowship of His suffering and the power of His resurrection. We have seen also that he stands in some special antithetic relation to Peter. We have admitted that ultimately it must be one who anywhere, in any generation, enters the eternal life, like the Evangelist himself, by appropriating "the mind which was in Christ Jesus." But the term "disciple whom Jesus loved" cannot well have been coined, nor his relation to the "first" of the

Twelve thus depicted, without a primary reference to that great Apostle who, when even Peter was recreant and blind to the real significance of the doctrine he professed to follow, cut into the very rock foundation of the Church the true gospel of the redemption. No language ever framed can so express the whole heart secret of the Fourth Gospel as that great utterance of Paul, wherein, as against the inadequate apprehension Peter had shown of the true meaning of the cross, he pours out his soul's experience of Christ. If the Fourth Gospel be "the heart of Christ," the heart of the Fourth Gospel is Paul's confession of his faith in Galatians ii. 20: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, WHO LOVED ME (τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με), and gave Himself up for me." In this sense Paul, and whosoever has had Paul's experience—whosoever has thus seen the Lord, whether in the body or out of the body, whosoever has come to "know Him and the power of His resurrection"—is the "disciple whom Jesus loved."

B. W. BACON.

THE AUTHENTICITY AND ORIGINALITY OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.

I. BEFORE the close of the second century of the Christian era the three Synoptic Gospels formed part of the undisputed Canon of the New Testament. And since that time until very recent years their authenticity has not been seriously questioned. At the present day the result of a very searching criticism has been to confirm the authenticity of St. Mark and St. Luke, but to place considerable doubt on the authorship of the Gospel attributed to St. Matthew, and this in spite of what seemed to earlier scholars indis-